

Applicant : Shunpei Yamazaki et al.
Serial No. : 09/814,255
Filed : March 21, 2001
Page : 2 of 4

Attorney's Docket No.: 07977-
107002 / US3194/3205/3215D1

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 3C and replaces the amended sheet including Figs. 3A, 3B and 3C.

In Figure 3C, a border line has been removed.

Attachments following last page of this Amendment:

Replacement Sheet (1 page)
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes (1 page)

REMARKS

Applicants thank Examiner Nadav for participating in telephone interviews with applicants' representative on April 3, 2008 and on April 7, 2008. During the interviews, applicants' representative communicated to the Examiner that the non-final Office Action mailed on January 10, 2008 did not take into consideration the claim amendment filed by applicants on December 13, 2007. The Examiner agreed to issue another non-final Office Action that takes into account the claim amendment of December 13, 2007.

Applicants note that the Examiner rejected claims 41-45, 47-53, 55 and 56, which were not amended in the December 13, 2007 amendment, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In an effort to expedite prosecution, applicants address this rejection at this time.

In particular, the Examiner asserts that the application specification provides no support for the limitations "wherein a part of the first layer ... [is] located over the interlayer insulating film" and "wherein the side recess is filled with the first layer." The Examiner asserts that Fig. 3C does not provide support for these limitations because it depicts a layer filling a side recess that is a separate and distinct layer from layer 320, which is located over the interlayer insulating film 214. Applicants assert that the border line in Fig. 3C that shows a layer filling the side recess that is separate and distinct from layer 320 is an error. Applicants include with this response an amendment to Fig. 3C that corrects this error and properly shows that layer 320, which is located over the interlayer insulating film 214, also fills the side recess. Applicants assert that the application specification provides support for this correction at page 10, line 24 to page 11, line 5 and at page 19, line 8 to page 20, line 5. Applicants specifically note for the Examiner the statement included at page 19, lines 12 to 14: "A mixed layer 320 ... is formed by the above reflow process, as a result of which a gap in the contact portion is filled and ... Thus, a superior contact is formed."

Accordingly, applicants assert that the application specification provides support for the above mentioned limitations and, therefore, respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 41-45, 47-53, 55 and 56 under section 112, first paragraph.

Applicant : Shunpei Yamazaki et al.
Serial No. : 09/814,255
Filed : March 21, 2001
Page : 4 of 4

Attorney's Docket No.: 07977-
107002 / US3194/3205/3215D1

No fees are believed due in connection with this filing. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,



Roberto J. Devoto
Reg. No. 55,108

Date: April 9, 2008

Customer No. 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331